

# 2002 Fall BRAC Meeting Notes

October 9 & 10, 2002

Grant County Public Works, Ephrata Washington

## Introduction and Opening Remarks

Al King brought the meeting to order at 8:30 am on October 9, 2002 at Grant County Public Works offices in Ephrata. Each of those present introduced themselves. The following is a list of attendees:

Name	Representing	Phone	Term	Email
Jeff Cameron	City of Longview	360-442-5221	2003	<a href="mailto:jcameron@ci.longview.wa.us">jcameron@ci.longview.wa.us</a>
Richard Miller	City of Seattle	206-684-5300	2004	<a href="mailto:richard.miller@ci.seattle.wa.us">richard.miller@ci.seattle.wa.us</a>
Dan Kaufman	City of Kennewick	509-585-4286	2005	<a href="mailto:daniel-kaufman@ci.kennewick.wa.us">daniel-kaufman@ci.kennewick.wa.us</a>
Rory Routh	City of Bellingham	360-676-6961	2006	<a href="mailto:ffouthe@cob.org">ffouthe@cob.org</a>
Bob Turpin	Jefferson County	360-385-9173	2006	<a href="mailto:bturpin@co.jefferson.wa.us">bturpin@co.jefferson.wa.us</a>
Gene Soules	Yakima County	509-574-2324	2003	<a href="mailto:genes@co.yakima.wa.us">genes@co.yakima.wa.us</a>
Jerry Bryant	Pierce County	253-798-7250	2004	<a href="mailto:jbryant@co.pierce.wa.us">jbryant@co.pierce.wa.us</a>
Derek Pohle	Grant County	509-754-6082	2005	<a href="mailto:publicworks@grantcounty-wa.com">publicworks@grantcounty-wa.com</a>
Al King	WSDOT H&LP	360-705-7375	---	<a href="mailto:kinga@wsdot.wa.gov">kinga@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Greg Kolle	WSDOT H&LP	360-705-7379	---	<a href="mailto:kolleg@wsdot.wa.gov">kolleg@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Ron Rolfer	WSDOT Prg Mgmt.	360-705-7375	---	<a href="mailto:rolferr@wsdot.wa.gov">rolferr@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Harvey Coffman	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2556	---	<a href="mailto:coffmah@wsdot.wa.gov">coffmah@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Dave Bruce*	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2570	---	<a href="mailto:bruced@wsdot.wa.gov">bruced@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Jerald Dodson	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2572	---	<a href="mailto:dodsonj@wsdot.wa.gov">dodsonj@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Susan Mazakowski	WSDOT Brdg Prsv	360-570-2543		<a href="mailto:MazikoS@wsdot.wa.gov">MazikoS@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Barry Brecto	FHWA	360-753-9482		<a href="mailto:Barry.Brecto@fhwa.dot.gov">Barry.Brecto@fhwa.dot.gov</a>
Susan Kovich	Nicholls Engineering	509-921-6747		<a href="mailto:susankovich@ix.netcom.com">susankovich@ix.netcom.com</a>
Jerome Wawers	Grant County	509-754-6082		<a href="mailto:jwawers@grantcounty-wa.com">jwawers@grantcounty-wa.com</a>
Jolene Gosselin	Douglas County	509-884-7173		<a href="mailto:jgosselin@co.douglas.wa.us">jgosselin@co.douglas.wa.us</a>
Jay Burney	City of Olympia	360-753-8740		<a href="mailto:jburney@ci.olympia.wa.us">jburney@ci.olympia.wa.us</a>
Mike Terrell	HDR	425-450-6260		<a href="mailto:mterrell@hdrinc.com">mterrell@hdrinc.com</a>
Jerry Sinclair	City of Spokane	509-625-6417		<a href="mailto:jsinclair@spokanecity.org">jsinclair@spokanecity.org</a>
Dick Raymond	City of Spokane	509-625-6398		<a href="mailto:draymond@spokanecity.org">draymond@spokanecity.org</a>
John Buckley	City of Mount Vernon	360-336-6284		<a href="mailto:johnb@ci.mount-vernon.wa.us">johnb@ci.mount-vernon.wa.us</a>
John Nixon	Kittitas County	509-962-7018		<a href="mailto:john@co.kittitas.wa.us">john@co.kittitas.wa.us</a>

\* Technical Committee Members

Aaron Butters was not present so Ron Rolfer voted as his alternate

Greg Kolle distributed and reviewed a list of the BRAC members and the agenda for the meeting. Notes from the 2002 Spring BRAC meeting were also distributed for reference.

### BRAC History

Kathleen Davis, Director of Highways & Local Programs, was scheduled to present some opening remarks but was unable to attend due to illness

Greg Kollé presented a brief history of BRAC including a funding history. Greg told the committee that \$714 million has been distributed by BRAC since its establishment in 1975.

### BRAC Funding

Estimated Annual Bridge Funds: Al King gave a brief overview of the projected funding explaining that 2002 is the last year of the Transportation Equity Act (TEA) 21. He explained that the new Act would probably be set at or above the current levels. Al handed out a graph that showed the funding and obligation trends from 1991 to projections in through 2007. He recommended funding level of \$53 million for the next year and asked the committee if they were comfortable with that number. The committee had no objections so the funding will stand at \$53 million. Al told the Committee that projects are moving ahead and we are chipping away at the \$70 million un-obligated balance.

Split of Federal Bridge Funds at 60/40: Greg Kollé told the Committee that the funding split continues at 40% for Local Agency projects, 60% for State projects. Greg also gave a brief history of the split and handed out copies of the letter 1997 explaining how it was determined. Greg pointed out that Washington State is unique in that local agencies have a defined share of the bridge replacement funding. Al King also gave the committee a brief history of how the State and Local split for various programs was decided.

15% Off System Annual Request: Greg circulated copies of the letter approving the request for a reduction of the required 15% funding of off-system projects to 5%. This deviation is necessary because the square footage of deficient local agency bridges is only approximately 5% so it is impossible for Washington to meet the 15% requirement. The new letter also gives the Washington FHWA Division Administrator the ability to grant the waiver annually in the future. We are required to continue to send through justification that the condition of our bridges warrants the deviation and that there is continued support from the Local Agencies.

Obligated Projects: Greg Kollé gave the Committee a handout that listed all outstanding projects. Greg explained that projects that have federal aid numbers have turned in their prospectus and have obligated the bridge funds. He also explained that once a project draws construction money it is removed from the list. The construction dates listed on the table are, for the most part, a best guess made with the information obtained from the local agencies. The handout shows a backlog of approximately \$200 million. Greg and Al explained some possible scenarios to address the obligation problems if a large number of projects selected before January 1, 2000 move to

construction shortly before the June 1, 2006 deadline as required by the Cost Containment Policy.

Bridge Project Aging: Al King then gave a brief history of the development of the cost containment criteria and reviewed the policy language handout. Al noted that the reason for the policy is to encourage agencies to present projects when they are ready to proceed or to wait so others who are prepared have a better chance of being selected. He also briefly showed the committee an internal memo that outlines the bridge project funding schedule which includes the procedures that lead to warning letters and project cancellation. Al briefly went over a draft of the BRAC Policy for Emergent Bridge Work that was included with the cost containment handout.

### **State of Our Local Agency Bridges**

Training Classes: Grant Griffin told the committee about the consistent good attendance we have been experiencing for the Bridge Condition Inspection Training classes. Grant pointed out that the Fundamentals and Bridge Inspection Training have been full while there has been good attendance to the Updates classes. In general, Updates training has had better attendance for classes held on the East Side of the state than the West side with the majority of the students being county personnel. Grant told the committee that we are encouraging better city attendance in the future.

Traffic Damage to Structural Elements: Grant gave a brief summary of bridges that were sustained damaged requiring a Critical Damage Bridge Repair Report. He pointed out that agencies are doing a good job of recognizing the need for this more in-depth tracking of the damage and repair. Agencies are using the updated information in Chapter 7 of the Bridge Inspection Manual to provide guidance along with help from the H&LP Bridge Office.

File Inspection Procedure Review: The agencies are doing a good job with their bridge programs. He has seen constant improvement in the bridge files with the agencies putting the information learned during training classes and file reviews into practice.

Inspection/Load Rating/Scour Evaluations: Agencies are demonstrating continued improvement in the inspection data turned in for updating. All agencies have voluntarily compiled Bridge Management System (BMS) data for their bridges. They are recognizing the value of the data as a tool for writing consistent bridge inspection reports and realize that they will be a step ahead when BMS is required for funding purposes. Grant related the good response he is receiving for field reviews of inspection procedures. For many inspectors this is the only feedback they have gotten on field work since their bridge inspection training course and they appreciate the input.

Load ratings are also being continually improved. The agencies recognize the deficiencies to look for and are correcting problems. They are also calling the H&LP Bridge Office with questions about load ratings they are not sure are correct.

Scour evaluations need improvement and the agencies will be getting updated clarified

## 2002 Fall BRAC Meeting Notes

---

information during the 2003 training classes. The H&LP Bridge Office will be working with the WSDOT Hydraulic Office to provide better guidance.

High Cost Bridge Inspection Program: Grant reported that Sixty-five, twelve year; high cost bridge inspection agreements have been executed. Additional agreements are being prepared as bridges needing high cost inspections are being identified and added to the master list. The master list is constantly being fine-tuned and the high cost inspection frequencies are being adjusted in accordance with the Bridge Inspection Manual. In addition, county inspectors performing bridge inspections for small cities have identified approximately twenty bridges that were not previously on the bridge inventory. The small cities are reaping other benefits from closer ties with county bridge offices such as guidance with grant applications and help with their bridge maintenance.

The following is a tally of the High Cost Inspections for 2002

- Approximately 140 UBIT/Fracture critical inspections
- Approximately 70 Routine for Small Counties (Garfield, Wahkiakum)
- 28 Underwater by consultant

An amendment has been made to Columbia County's agreement to take over their routine inspections. Their agreement is now similar to the small county agreements in place for Garfield and Wahkiakim Counties.

FHWA 2002 NBIS Review: Grant then made some brief comments on the 2002 NBIS Review. Barry Brecto of FHWA inspected the bridge programs for two local agencies along with field reviews of bridge inspections done by Bridge Preservation for the State. Barry then gave a more comprehensive overview of the NBIS review and his observations about this year's trip. Barry said that, in general, the agencies are doing a good job with their programs. A couple of weaknesses were identified such as the need for additional scour evaluation clarification and guidance and the need for actual procedures for underwater inspections. The previous underwater inspection report along with the local agency version of the scope of work underwater inspections had been used as procedures in the past. Barry pointed out that this was not correct and that the reports and scope of work should be used to write actual procedures. These two points will be focused on in the Updates classes this winter.

Barry then gave the committee some information on where Washington State stands nationally on deficient bridges by deck area. Barry pointed out that Washington State's deficient bridges are predominantly Functionally Obsolete (FO) where as many States, especially as you look east, are predominately Structurally Deficient (SD). Washington State's bridges are approximately 75% FO and many eastern states have just the opposite, 75% SD. These statistics are the result of new performance measures used by FHWA that track deficient bridges by deck area instead of simply by number of bridges. The deck area measurements better reflect costs associated with bridge repair

and replacement. The next step FHWA is looking at is how to use BMS as a tool to decide how to best spend bridge replacement dollars.

Barry told the committee about a study that is being done at the FHWA lab at Turner Fairbanks on the implementation of BMS as a tool to determine bridge condition and to determine funding. BMS information from the fifty state databases is being forwarded to the lab for comparison. The lab will look for common information from all states as an indicator of the kinds of information FHWA should collect.

Prior to Barry's presentation Greg handed out some sample inspection forms and explained the coding that is done and the information collected during bridge inspections. He explained the difference between BMS elements and condition states and NBIS condition codes. This information was presented in preparation for the Preventive Maintenance (PM) discussion scheduled for the afternoon. An important aspect of PM is the use of BMS element data for PM funding decisions.

Greg moved some of the afternoon agenda items forward because the meeting was running ahead of schedule.

### **Review of Criteria and Worksheets**

Preliminary Project Site Reviews: Greg Kolle handed out the written procedure for Preliminary Project Site Reviews (formerly C3R). Greg pointed out that bridges that are selected at a BRAC meeting are recommended for funding, they are not yet funded. Prior to being approved for funding a Preliminary Project Site Review must be performed at which time recommendations are made about the type of bridge to be built and decisions are made studies that may be required such as hydraulic studies or Type, Size and Location (TS&L) reports. Bridges that are determined to be good projects at the Preliminary Project Site Review are recommended for funding to the Director of Highways & Local Programs for final approval. Not all projects are selected by BRAC are funded. Some projects are identified as poor projects at the site review and turned down for funding. In this event bridge owners are usually advised of a time frame and procedure for re-submitting the project. Greg went through the handout with the committee explaining each step of the process.

Replacement and Rehabilitation Criteria: Greg Kolle went through the replacement and rehabilitation criteria handouts. The handouts not only covered replacement and rehabilitation criteria but included copies of the cost containment policy, the bridge funding questionnaire and the bridge project funding schedule covered earlier by Al King. Greg briefly touched on each handout identifying important points for the committee.

### **Project Status Presentations**

Representatives from five local agencies gave project status presentations. Three were for projects, Olympia's 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge, Mount Vernon's Riverside Bridge, and Spokane's Monroe Street Bridge are all estimated to cost in excess of \$20 million each.

## 2002 Fall BRAC Meeting Notes

---

The city of Seattle's Freemont Bridge Approach project is projected to cost over \$13 million and Douglas County's Chief Joseph Dam Bridge is being jointly funded by bridge replacement and innovative bridge research and construction dollars.

Jolene Gosselin, Douglas County Engineer, outlined the rehabilitation of the Chief Joseph Dam Bridge. The historic timber deck truss will be widened with polymer deck panels and the timber approach spans will be replaced. Jolene told the committee the steps taken so far and the lessons she's learned during the early design process.

Dick Raymond and Jerry Sinclair of the city of Spokane told the committee about the design process for the Monroe Street Bridge rehabilitation which led to a successful bid opening in **September**. They outlined some of the interesting design features and some of the challenges they overcame in the design process. Construction is due to start this **fall**.

The next project was the Riverside Bridge between Mount Vernon and Burlington. John Buckley, Mount Vernon's Public Works Director, told the committee about some of the construction problems that have occurred and plans to remedy the problems left in their wake. John reported that the contractor had made some adjustments and the contract was proceeding well. He also explained what they planned to do to get the contract back on schedule as much as possible.

Jay Burney of the city of Olympia provided an update on the progress of the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge replacement project. Jay told the committee about a very well run project that has been running smoothly and on schedule. He explained some of the innovative and time saving procedures used by the contractor and about up front work that resulted in few surprises during construction. Jay told the committee that a million dollars in contingency money set aside for construction problems during the subgrade work was not used. The new bridge is slated to open in December 2003 with final completion of the project in June 2004.

The final presentation was Seattle's Freemont Bridge approach span replacement. Richard Miller of Seattle Department of Transportation and BRAC member gave the rest of the committee an overview of what has been done. Richard explained that the City has a consultant on board and that public meetings have begun. The consultant has come up scenarios that would require bridge closures of differing duration for the public to comment on. The meetings are well attended and facilitate valuable interaction between the public and the designers.

## Preventive Maintenance Funding and Prioritization Criteria

Greg Kolle passed out copies of the proposed funding and prioritization criteria developed during the Fall 2002 BRAC Technical Committee meeting held in September. This task was assigned during the Spring 2002 BRAC meeting. Greg pointed out that PM is intended to be BMS driven. Greg proposed that full implementation of BMS prioritization be completed in a six year period in order to ensure consistent BMS information between the Local Agencies. The criteria

presented contains interim prioritization methods. Greg also reminded the committee that PM offers more flexibility to make serviceable bridge last longer and forestall replacement. PM will let an agency receive funding to fix just what is wrong with a bridge without the requirement of bringing all other aspects of the bridge up to federal standards.

Al King asked the committee to consider whether or not the Local Agencies would want to add this additional program to the demand on bridge replacement funds. He asked the committee to consider whether or not the additional requirements attached to the use of federal dollars are worth the effort for smaller projects. Al pointed out that there are still many replacement and rehabilitation projects to be done as illustrated by Barry's presentation during the morning session.

Concerns were voiced as to whether programs like PM are getting away from the original quest of BRAC. Another concern had to do with the possibility that the use of ADT in the criteria might shift funds to urban areas and that the new program might dilute the fund source.

Others felt that PM could be a way to shift the use of funds from reactive to proactive. The idea here is that some bridges are allowed to continue to deteriorate to a point where they are eligible for rehabilitation or replacement. With funding help some moderate size projects might get done that will extend the overall life some bridges. It was noted that the problem of whether maintenance is ignored to the point that bridges need rehabilitation or replacement dose not cause the Bridge Replacement Program to be discontinued.

Some see the PM program as a way for agencies that do not have a preventive maintenance program in place to start being more proactive in extending the life of their bridges. Others see the program as a way to start moving towards implementing a bridge management system and put agencies in a better position when BMS is mandated for condition rating and funding prioritization.

The question of whether rural counties with simple basic bridges would see any advantage form the PM program was asked. Greg pointed out that if a large urban bridge receives PM funds forestalling a major more expensive replacement project then more smaller bridges will be funded sooner with the difference.

When the subject of the increased requirements attached to receiving federal money was revisited, Barry Brecto reminded the committee that the approval to use bridge replacement funds for PM was a response to a desire voiced nationally for this type of program. The Federal Highway Administration recognizes the cost increase involved with using federal funds and is concerned about the additional work involved for all participants. For this reason a minimum dollar amount of \$30 thousand dollars has been proposed in the criteria.

Al King suggested the committee adjourn for the day at 4:30 pm pointing out that the first agenda item for the morning is to continue discussion of the PM program. This

schedule was arranged to allow members the evening to go over the criteria handout and think about the afternoon's discussion.

### Day Two

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. at which time Al King called for additional comments on the Preventive Maintenance Program.

The question of whether or not the PM program would force the implementation of BMS sooner was addressed. Greg Kollé told the committee that BMS is not mandated at this time but the Local Agencies have been voluntarily proactive in preparing for the day when BMS is mandated. The trend at FHWA is moving toward BMS so it is in our best interest to be prepared. Al King disagreed saying that he believed the PM program would force the use of BMS sooner. It was pointed out that BMS is inevitable and a small program may be a good way to get used to the new system.

The following points were reiterated:

- There is a fear that the PM program may become a reward for poor maintenance.
- Spending money early is better than waiting for smaller problems to become big problems. This holds true even with the inefficiencies related to the additional federal requirements.

It was proposed to set up a PM program and rely on BRAC's discretion to ensure the best distribution of the funds.

There was concern voiced about the electrical/mechanical category. Some felt it was too directly focused on a couple of agencies. Greg pointed out the inclusion of electrical/mechanical was just an attempt to help with the large expense involved in keeping these types of bridges in service. It was pointed out that the committee is not required to approve all categories presented in the criteria handout. It was also noted that the committee will still decide on which projects get funded so projects type should not be a problem.

Jeff Cameron made a motion to adopt the Preventive Maintenance program with the stipulation that the criteria will continue to be refined.

Richard Miller seconded and the motion passed with one negative vote by

### **\* Jerry Bryant \***

A couple of committee members do not like preventive maintenance as a name for the program. Greg Kollé pointed out that the new law is called preventative maintenance. Al King suggested that the H&LP bridge office will come up with some names that will be presented to the committee for comment. It was suggested that comments on the



criteria be submitted by e-mail and Al King asked for a general direction so work can begin on the edits.

It was pointed out that seismic retrofit dose not extend the life of the bridge. Greg said that it falls more into the risk reduction category, as dose scour, and the PM program is the best fit of available programs

Specifics of the criteria were discussed. The eligibility criteria for deck repair is 2% of entire deck area in condition states 2 through 4 are eligible. A change was suggested to 2% in condition state 3 and 4. Greg said the original criteria was modeled after what the state was proposing for their program. Greg said he would get clarification from DeWayne Wilson and report back to the Committee.

It was also suggested that some suitable back-up information should be submitted with the application to provide the committee with some assurance that the proposed repair would extend the life of the bridge for the 15-year period until the bridge is again eligible for federal bridge replacement funds. The Committee wondered if an owner should be penalized if a repair fails in less than 15 years and it was decided that that eventuality could be dealt with on a case-to-case basis. Greg also pointed out that the restrictions was meant to apply to replacement projects not other PM needs.

A few other points were discussed until Al King suggested a recap in the interest of time. The main points were as follows:

- All categories listed on the criteria handout will be included.
- The minimum dollar threshold will be revisited and possibly increased to \$50 thousand.
- If suggested, other categories will be considered.
- Report providing life expectancy information to help determine feasibility of projects.
- Repairs done with PM funding will be permanent.

Al asked for additional points and none were suggested.

## Funding Levels

Al suggested a funding level of \$53 million for next Spring and Fall BRAC 2003 (see above for discussion). The following split was suggested:

Greg Kolle outlined the typical Spring/Fall funding split as follows:

## 2002 Fall BRAC Meeting Notes

---

Program	Replacement	Rehabilitation	Preventive Maint.
Spring	\$20 million	\$10 million	\$3 million
Fall	\$20 million	—	—

The exact split for the Spring meeting will be determined by the projects presented and where the committee sees the greatest need.

Jeff Cameron moved to approve the funding levels listed above. Rory Routh seconded the motion which passed with a unanimous vote.

Committee Roles: Al King welcomed to Bob Turpin to the committee as a new member. Al then reviewed an article adopted during the Fall 2001 BRAC meeting. The article addresses the question of conflict of interest that arises when a BRAC member's agency present a project for the Committee's consideration.

Greg Kolle then explained the selection process for BRAC Technical Committee members and explained their terms. Greg then gave to floor to Dave Bruce to explain the Technical Committee member roles and procedures. He also explained the normalization process that is used for the Fall BRAC candidates. Dave then fielded some brief questions.

### Presentation of Candidates

Jerald Dodson then presented the twenty-eight Fall BRAC bridge replacement candidates.

Following Jerald's presentation there was a brief discussion and a question and answer session. Questions were raised about Spokane County's Barker Road over Spokane River. It appeared to the committee that primary driver behind the project was a capacity issue rather than structural problems. They felt a repair would adequately address the structural problems. The Committee also noted that Snohomish county had a large number of old projects on the books which reflected an inability to carry projects to completion. They noted that Snohomish County's Deer Creek Bridge was rated as a good candidate in only one technical committee category.

Jeff Cameron motioned to fund candidates 1 - 26 except 17 (Barker Road) for the reason noted above. Richard Miller seconded the motion.

More discussion followed after which Richard Miller proposed an amended motion of funding bridges 1 – 28 except 17 (Barker Road) and 26 (Deer Creek). Again, the exceptions were for the reasons noted above. Jerry Bryant seconded this motion which passed with a unanimous vote.

## 2002 Fall BRAC Meeting Notes

---

The following is the final list of selected bridges:

Rank	Agency	Bridge Name	SID Number	\$ Millions
1.	Kittitas County	Naneum Rd.- Naneum Cr.	08275400	0.38
2.	Grant County	7 NW	08340200	0.40
3.	Grant County	M NW	08143200	.039
4.	Lewis County	Newaukum River Br. 20	08161200	1.49
5.	Stevens County	Rocky Creek Bridge	08076500	0.38
6.	Snohomish County	May Creek	08013100	0.81
7.	Skagit County	Burlington Alger Road	08238900	0.79
8.	Grant County	S NW	08157500	0.14
9.	Franklin County	North Wahluke R	08214900	0.23
10.	Ocean Shores	Bass Avenue	08500300	0.45
11.	Klickitat County	Rock Creek	08117400	0.37
12.	Adams County	Ed Victor	07977700	0.21
13.	Whitman County	White Elephant	08326300	0.85
14.	Yakima County	Fort Road #1354	0002471A	1.52
15.	Spokane County	Valley Chapel @ Spangle	08131200	1.24
16.	Franklin County	Everett Road	08169500	0.28
18.	Montesano	Sylvia Creek	08498700	0.26
19.	Lincoln County	Cochran Bridge	08354100	0.44
20.	Whitman County	Henderson Mill	08238000	1.12
21.	Grays Harbor County	Cloquallum Creek	08323800	0.92
22.	Stevens County	Headlund	08386500	3.02
23.	Whitman County	Staley No. 3	08369300	0.62
24.	Snohomish County	Marten Creek	08317400	1.10
25.	Whitman County	Farband	07963900	0.68
27.	Lincoln County	G. Kuntz Bridge No. 63011	07974000	0.39
28.	Lincoln County	Perry Bridge	08172200	0.36
			<b>Total</b>	<b>18.83</b>

### Future Meeting Dates:

Spring 2003 BRAC meeting were set for May 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>, 2003. The tentative meeting place will be Pierce County Public Works in Tacoma.

The dates set for the Fall 2004 BRAC meeting were set for October 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.